

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 115

UD 010 752

AUTHOR Myers, Robert B.
TITLE Problems in School Desegregation: Two Summer Institutes for School Leaders.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville.
PUB DATE 25 Aug 65
CONTRACT OEC-5-37-018
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Civil Rights Legislation; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Integration Methods; Integration Plans; *Leadership; *School Integration; Summer Institutes

IDENTIFIERS Florida

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the program were to assist 24 teams averaging five leaders per team to plan the strategy and procedures of desegregation in their school systems. This was accomplished by being briefed on the provisions of the Civil Rights Bill, by analyzing the problems incident to desegregation in their own school system, and by formulating plans for the orderly desegregation of their schools. The participants were provided with theoretical exploration to increase their understandings of communication, leadership, formation and reconstruction of attitudes, analysis of the nature of prejudice, curricular implications of desegregation, instructional implications of desegregation, and school organization. The training phases were from June 14-July 2, 1965 and from July 12-July 30, 1965. A follow-up phase began August 1, 1965 and ended July 31, 1966. [For 1966 report, see ED 028 229.] (Author)

010752 cat

PROBLEMS IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION:
TWO SUMMER INSTITUTES FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

Author of Report: Dr. Robert B. Myers, Associate Professor,
University of Florida

Contract Number: OE-5-37-018
P. L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 404
The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Name of Program Director: Dr. Robert B. Myers

Imprint of Contractor: Board of Regents
University of Florida

The Project Reported Herein Was Supported by a Contract from
the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Date Transmitted: August 25, 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED056115

UD 010 752

2. Abstract

(a) Identification:

- (1) Title of Project: Problems in School Desegregation:
Two Summer Institutes for School Leaders
- (2) Author of Report: Dr. Robert B. Myers, Associate Professor,
University of Florida
- (3) Contract Number: OE-5-37-018
P. L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 404
The Civil Rights Act of 1964
- (4) Name of Program Director: Dr. Robert B. Myers
- (5) Imprint of Contractor: Board of Regents
University of Florida
- (6) The Project Reported Herein Was Supported by a Contract
from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- (7) Date Transmitted: August 25, 1965

(b) Dates:

- (1) Planning phase: May 1, 1965 to June 11, 1965
- (2) Training phase: June 14 - July 2, 1965
July 12 - July 30, 1965
- (3) Follow-up phase: August 1, 1965 - July 31, 1966

(c) Participants:

- (1) Total number: 133
- (2) Types of personnel: Central office - 26
Principals - 78
Counselors - 12
Teachers - 17
- (3) School systems represented: 23 Florida and 1 Georgia

(d) Objectives of the Program:

To assist 24 teams averaging five school system leaders per team to plan the strategy and procedures of desegregation in their

2. Abstract (continued)

school systems. This was to be accomplished by being thoroughly briefed on the provisions of the Civil Rights Bill, by analyzing the problems incident to desegregation in their own school system, and by formulating plans for the orderly desegregation of their schools. To facilitate the commitment of individual participants to desegregation, the participants were provided with theoretical exploration to increase their understandings of communication, leadership, the formation and reconstruction of attitudes, analysis of the nature of prejudice, curricular implications of desegregation, instructional implications of desegregation, and school organization.

(e) Brief Description of the Procedures:

The institute procedures included lectures, reading, case studies, role-playing, small and large group discussion, preparation of plans and recommendations for desegregation by county school system teams, counseling sessions, evaluation sessions, county team reports--both written and oral--and informal activities.

(f) Results and Conclusions:

The results of the institutes were generally constructive and positive. Many participants, both Negro and white, called the institute one of the most significant experiences in their lives. Some whites, segregationists at the beginning, may have remained unmoved by the interaction and by the information supplied by a fine collection of consultants. Many other whites became fully aware, for the first time, of the magnitude of the problem generated by segregation and modified their beliefs. Many Negroes became hopeful and enthusiastic during the institute while some remained passive especially in large group discussions.

The larger, more cosmopolitan county teams set a standard for the rural, traditionally conservative county teams regarding human rights and the quality of the county team reports and recommendations that each team was to make to their superintendent and board upon returning home.

The participants, representing the leadership positions of the central office and schools within a county system, were far above average in educational experience, degrees held, and leadership. County team work sessions and large group discussions were problem-directed and fruitful.

Patterns of communication between persons of different races developed and for some it was the first time in their lives that they had worked with members of the other race closely, as peers, on common problems.

2. Abstract (continued)

The quality of many county team reports were very good. Six teams prepared Title 405 proposals in the institutes to underwrite their plans for inservice education programs for the 1965-1966 school year. Plans were made in the institutes for follow-up meetings on campus during the coming year and for consultant help to the counties.

It is believed that the institutes were quite successful. Indications are that purposeful and numerous follow-up activities initiated by the participants will result and that those county school systems which took part in the summer institutes will do a vastly better job of desegregation planning than otherwise could be expected.

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants:

- (1) Name, business address, and title of each participant by institute and county:

a. 1st Institute: June 14 - July 2, 1965

Alachua County

Ralph Blount, Principal
Myra Terwilliger Elementary
School
301 N.W. 62nd Street
Gainesville, Florida

Edwin Edris, Guidance
Counselor
Hawthorne High School
Hawthorne, Florida

Samuel I. Hendrix, Director
of Non-Vocational Education
Alachua County Board of
Public Instruction
Gainesville, Florida

Crystal Hord, Guidance
Counselor
Westwood Junior High School
1338 N.W. 31st Terrace
Gainesville, Florida

L. B. Lindsey, Principal
Santa Fe High School
Alachua, Florida

Anna Nealy, Guidance Counselor
Lincoln High School
1001 S. E. 12th
Gainesville, Florida

John Neller, Asst. Principal
Gainesville High School
Gainesville, Florida

Bob Prine, Principal
Micanopy Junior High School
Micanopy, Florida

Jim Pritchett, Principal
Newberry High School
Newberry, Florida

Fred Silvia, County Staff
County of Alachua
Board of Public Instruction
Gainesville, Florida

Tommy Tomlinson, Principal
Howard Bishop Junior High
901 N.E. 9th Avenue
Gainesville, Florida

Clayton Whitfield, Principal
A. L. Mebane High School
Alachua, Florida

Brevard County

Harding Bailey, Asst.
Principal
Stone School
Melbourne, Florida

George Maxwell, Principal
Eau Gallie High School
1400 Stewart Road
Eau Gallie, Florida

Roy Schoolfield, School
Psychologist
County Office
Titusville, Florida

Switzon Wigfall, Asst.
Principal
Monroe Jr./Sr. High School
Cocoa, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Brevard County

Clyde E. Stevens, Principal
Cocoa High School
Cocoa, Florida

Frank Williams, Principal
Gibson School
Titusville, Florida

Columbia County

Lucille Dykes
Elementary Supervisor
P. O. Box 1148
Lake City, Florida

A. W. Levy
Itinerant Music Teacher
Minnie J. Niblack School
Lake City, Florida

M. L. Ferguson, Principal
Richardson High School
Lake City, Florida

S. W. Rayburn, Principal
Columbia High School
P. O. Box 1059
Lake City, Florida

Paul S. Giebeig, Principal
Five Points Elementary
School
P. O. Box 1268
Lake City, Florida

Dade County

Lucille Bell, Teacher
Mays High School
P. O. Box 467
Goulds, Florida

Mrs. Ida Ratcliffe, Principal
Brownsville Jr. High School
4899 N.W. 24th Avenue
Miami, Florida

Evelyn Counts, Teacher
George W. Carver High
4901 Lincoln Drive
Coconut Grove, Florida

Mr. Robert Simms, Teacher
George W. Carver High
4901 Lincoln Drive
Coconut Grove, Florida 33133

Jeanette Frierson, Teacher
George W. Carver High
4901 Lincoln Drive
Coconut Grove, Florida 33133

Leonard Speisman, Teacher
Miami Carol City Sr. High
3422 N.W. 187th Street
Opa-Locka, Florida

Mary Katherine Mills, Counselor
Coral Gables Sr. High School
450 Bird Road
Coral Gables, Florida

Eddie Stevens, Counselor
George W. Carver High
4901 Lincoln Drive
Coconut Grove, Florida 33133

Joseph Pieze, Teacher
North Dade High School
1840 N.W. 157 Street
Opa-Locka, Florida

Elishama Starke, Teacher
Richmond Heights Jr. High
15015 S.W. 103 Avenue
Miami, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Dade County

Lawrence Rafield, Teacher
South Dade Sr. High School
28401 S.W. 167 Avenue
Homestead, Florida

Eleanor Tidwell, Teacher
Coral Gables Sr. High
450 Bird Road
Coral Gables, Florida

Donald A. Wood, Teacher
Miami Palmetto Senior High
7640 S.W. 118th Street
Miami, Florida

Glynn County (Georgia)

Fred M. Wild, Curriculum Director
County Schools
Board of Education
Brunswick, Georgia

Monroe County

Glynn R. Archer, Jr.
Principal
Key West High School
2100 Flagler Avenue
Key West, Florida

Margaret McCluskey, Teacher
(home address)
P. O. Box 544
Tavernier, Florida

Otha Cox, Guidance Counselor
2100 Flagler Avenue
Key West, Florida

Lew Schlegal, Teacher
Marathon High School
Marathon, Florida

Armando Henriquez, Assistant
Superintendent of Public
Instruction
Monroe County
Key West, Florida

Palm Beach County

Mrs. Olivia Baldwin
County Superintendent
The Board of Public Instruction
Palm Beach County
301 North Olive Avenue
West Palm Beach, Florida

Renice Lansing, Principal
Boynton Beach Jr. High
501 N.W. 2nd Avenue
Boynton Beach, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Palm Beach County

Carl Crawford, Principal
Belle Glade Elementary School
7th and Canal Street
Belle Glade, Florida

Jesse Ferguson, Counselor
John F. Kennedy High School
P. O. Box 10606
Riviera Beach, Florida

Edna E. Parker, General
Supervisor
Building 5502
6th Street, North
Air Base
West Palm Beach, Florida

C. Spencer Pompey, Asst.
Principal
Carver High School
Delray Beach, Florida

Polk County

Howard L. Beynon, Principal
Ft. Mead High School
Ft. Mead, Florida

Roy L. Caldwell, Principal
Oakland High School
Haines City, Florida

David A. Lofgren, Principal
Mulberry Jr./Sr. High
Mulberry, Florida

Roe M. Martin, Supervisor of
Testing and Research
Board of Public Instruction
Bartow, Florida

C. H. Ortt, Principal
Winter Haven Sr. High
Winter Haven, Florida

George W. Rich, Principal
Frostproof High School
Frostproof, Florida

James E. Stephens, Principal
Union Academy High
Bartow, Florida

St. Johns County

Robert T. Godwin, Supervisor
of Secondary Education
Board of Public Instruction
Box 450
St. Augustine, Florida

Malcomb Jones
Dean of Boys
Box 465
Murray High School
St. Augustine, Florida

Otis Mason, Principal
Walter E. Harris School
Hastings, Florida 32045

Dean O. Moorhouse, Principal
R. B. Hunt Elementary
Anastasia Island
St. Augustine, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Seminole County

Freeman Baggett, Principal
Westside-Grammar Elementary
School
Sanford, Florida

Edward Blacksheare, Asst.
Principal
Crooms High School
Sanford, Florida

Sumter County

C. L. Brooks, Principal
South Sumter High School
Bushnell, Florida

Mr. Joe R. Strickland
Principal
Wildwood High School
Wildwood, Florida

Marvin H. Jones, Principal
Mills High School
Webster, Florida

H. B. Whitehurst, Principal
J. R. E. Lee High School
Wildwood, Florida

Bernard R. Shelnutt, Jr.
Secondary Supervisor
P. O. Box 428
Bushnell, Florida

b. 2nd Institute: July 12 - July 31, 1965

Alachua County

C. C. Combs, Principal
Kirby Smith Elementary
School
Gainesville, Florida

E. D. Manning, Principal
Stephen Foster Elementary
Gainesville, Florida

Joe Hudson, Principal
Gainesville High School
Gainesville, Florida

Cornelius Norton, Coordinator
of Negro Schools
County Personnel
1817 East Univ. Avenue
Gainesville, Florida

Bill Irby, Principal
Alachua Elementary School
Alachua, Florida

C. E. Palmour, Principal
Sidney Lanier Elementary School
Gainesville, Florida

L. M. Jackson, Principal
Duval Elementary School
Gainesville, Florida

Matt Parramore, Principal
J. J. Finlay Elementary
Gainesville, Florida

Thelma Jordan, Principal
A. Q. Jones Elementary School
Gainesville, Florida

John Perdue, Principal
Buchholz Jr. High School
Gainesville, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Clay County

Eugenia Argrett, Principal
Bannerman Elementary School
Green Cove Springs, Florida

J. H. Boulware, Principal
Orange Park Elementary
Orange Park, Florida

Pope Griffin, Assistant
Principal
Orange Park High School
Orange Park, Florida

Roy Roddy, Superintendent
Staff
P. O. Box 1042
Starke, Florida

Rhoda Williams, Visiting
Teacher, Superintendent
Staff
Office of the Superintendent
Clay County
Green Cove Springs, Florida

Collier County

Valera Barker
Elementary Supervisor
(County School System)
Naples, Florida

L. E. Predmore
Secondary Supervisor
(County School System)
Naples, Florida

Ola Mae Butler, Principal
Carver School
Naples, Florida

E. W. Woodruff, Principal
Naples Senior High School
Naples, Florida

Eugene Williams, Principal
Bethune High School
Immokalee, Florida

Glades County

Robert Gamble, Principal
Booker T. Washington High School
Moore Haven, Florida

Juanita Richie, Teacher
Moore Haven Elementary
Moore Haven, Florida

A. M. Richie, Principal
Moore Haven Elementary
Moore Haven, Florida

Hillsborough County

Calvin C. Bexley, Principal
Meacham Elementary School
Tampa, Florida

Sylvia D. Collins, Teacher
Blake High School
Tampa, Florida

James Thomas, Director of
Pupil Assignment
4218 Leona
Tampa, Florida

Charles Vacher, Asst. Principal
Robinson High School
Tampa, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Hillsborough County

Rosa L. Duhart, Dean
Just Junior High
Tampa, Florida

Linda Kay Johnson, Teacher
Town and Country Elementary
Tampa, Florida

Mary Smith, Family Life
Consultant
3307 Dorchester
Tampa, Florida

Beecher W. Payne, Principal
Monroe Jr. High School
Tampa, Florida

Oleta H. Vines, Counselor
Mann Junior High School
Brandon, Florida

Charles Menendez, Teacher
Oakgrove Junior High School
Tampa, Florida

Denton Cook, Assistant
Superintendent for Services
P. O. Box 3408
Tampa, Florida

Lake County

Clarence Kinsler, Principal
Dabney Elementary School
Leesburg, Florida

S. T. E. Pinkney, Principal
Carver Heights High School
Leesburg, Florida

H. Jennings Rou, Principal
Tavares High School
Tavares, Florida

Walter Simmons, Principal
Eustis Vocational School
Eustis, Florida

Marvin Styles, Principal
Clermont High School
Clermont, Florida

Manatee County

Florine Abel
Supervisor in Education
Manatee County School Board
Bradenton, Florida

Warren A. Cooper, Principal
S. E. High School
Bradenton, Florida

George Marshall
Consultant in English and
Social Studies
County School Board
Bradenton, Florida

James Tillman, Principal
Lincoln Memorial High School
Palmetto, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Marion County

Eugene F. Broxton, Principal
Fessenden High School
Ocala, Florida

John H. Wheeler,
Secondary Supervisor
Marion County Schools
P. O. Box 670
Ocala, Florida

Palm Beach County

Jausita Denson, Administrative
Assistant
J. C. Mitchell Elementary School
Boca Raton, Florida

Paul Matwiy, Principal
J. C. Mitchell Elementary
School
Boca Raton, Florida

Pinellas County

Gerald Caffrey, Principal
Glenoak Elementary School
St. Petersburg, Florida

Constance Sneed, Teacher
Lakeview Elementary School
Largo, Florida

Louis McCoy, Principal
George Perkins Elementary School
2400 Queensboro Avenue, South
St. Petersburg, Florida

Emanuel Stewart, Principal
Gibbs Senior High School
St. Petersburg, Florida

Isabel Vanderbilt, Coordinator
of Guidance
Southside Junior High School
St. Petersburg, Florida

Putnam County

Philip Alvers, Principal
Moseley Elementary School
Palatka, Florida

Kathleen Greene, Principal
James A. Long Elementary
Route 2, Box 700
Palatka, Florida

Homer Biddle, Principal
Browning-Pierce Elementary
East Palatka, Florida

LeRoy Mullen, Principal
Central Academy Elementary
1207 Washington Street
Palatka, Florida

Fred Brooks, Principal
Central Adademy High School
North 19th Street
Palatka, Florida

Moses Owens, Guidance Counselor
Central Academy High School
North 19th Street
Palatka, Florida

Thomas Dodamead, Director
of Guidance
St. Johns River Guidance Center
5001 St. Johns Avenue
Palatka, Florida

Vernon Tillman, Teacher
Board of Public Instruction
P. O. Box 797
Palatka, Florida

3. Full Description of Program

(a) Participants: (continued)

Putnam County

Fred Young, Principal
Melrose High School
P. O. Box 186
Melrose, Florida

Seminole County

George Dabbs, Principal
Bear Lake Elementary School
Forest City, Florida

Jesse L. Meuse, Principal
Rosenwald Elementary School
Altamonte Springs, Florida

Herold Heckenbach, Principal
Pinecrest Elementary School
Sanford, Florida

Stanley Muller, Principal
Jackson Heights Elementary
Oviedo, Florida

Suwannee County

Leroy Bowdoin, General
Supervisor
Suwannee County Schools
Live Oak, Florida

John J. Johnson, Principal
Suwannee High School
Live Oak, Florida

Mrs. Shellie Q. Brown
Assistant Supervisor
Suwannee County Schools
Live Oak, Florida

(2) Racial Composition of Participants:

1st Institute -- 25 Negroes -- 41 whites
2nd Institute -- 28 Negroes -- 39 whites

Total -- 53 Negroes -- 80 whites

Types of School Personnel Represented:

Central Office -- 26 persons
Principals -- 78 persons
Counselors -- 12 persons
Teachers -- 17 persons
Total 133

Number of School systems Represented: 24

(a) Participants: (continued)

(2) Schools within each System Represented:

Alachua County (17)
(1st and 2nd Institutes)

A. L. Mebane High School
 A. Q. Jones Elementary
 Alachua Elementary
 Buchholz Junior High
 Duval Elementary
 Gainesville High School
 Hawthorne High School
 Howard Bishop Junior High
 J. J. Finlay Elementary
 Kirby Smith Elementary School
 Lincoln High School
 Micanopy Junior High School
 Myra Terwilliger Elementary
 Santa Fe High School
 Stephen Foster Elementary
 Sidney Lanier Elementary
 Westwood Junior High School

Brevard County (5)
(1st Institute)

Cocoa High School
 Eau Gallie High School
 Gibson School
 Monroe Jr./Sr. High School
 Stone School

Clay County (3)
(2nd Institute)

Bannerman Elementary School
 Orange Park Elementary School
 Orange Park High School

Collier County (3)
(2nd Institute)

Bethune High School
 Carver School
 Naples Senior High School

Columbia County (4)
(1st Institute)

Columbia High School
 Five Points Elementary School
 Minnie J. Niblack School
 Richardson High School

(a) Participants: (continued)

(2) Schools within each System Represented:

Dade County (9)
(1st Institute)

Brownsville Junior High School
 Coral Gables Senior High School
 George Washington Carver High
 Mays High School
 Miami Carol City High School
 Miami Palmetto Senior High School
 North Dade Senior High School
 Richmond Heights Junior High
 South Dade Senior High

Glades County (2)
(2nd Institute)

Booker T. Washington High School
 Moore Haven Elementary School

Glynn County (Georgia)
(1st Institute)

None

Hillsborough County (8)

Blake High School
 Just Junior High School
 Mann Junior High School
 Meacham Elementary School
 Monroe Junior High
 Oakgrove Junior High School
 Robinson High School
 Town and Country Elementary

Lake County (5)
(2nd Institute)

Carver Heights High School
 Clermont High School
 Dabney Elementary School
 Eustis Vocational School
 Tavares High School

Manatee County (2)
(2nd Institute)

Lincoln Memorial High School
 S. E. High School

(a) Participants: (continued)

(2) Schools within each System Represented:

Marion County (1)
(2nd Institute)

Fessenden High School

Monroe County (2)
(1st Institute)Key West High School
Marathon High SchoolPalm Beach County (5)
(1st and 2nd Institutes)Belle Glade Elementary
Boynton Beach Elementary School
Carver High School
J. C. Mitchell Elementary
John F. Kennedy High SchoolPinellas County (5)
(2nd Institute)George Perkins Elementary
Gibbs Senior High School
Glenoak Elementary School
Lakeview Elementary School
Southside Junior High SchoolPolk County (6)
(1st Institute)Fort Mead High School
Frostproof High School
Mulberry Jr. /Sr. High School
Oakland High School
Union Academy High School
Winter Haven Senior HighPutnam County (5)
(2nd Institute)Browning-Pierce Elementary
Central Academy Elementary
Central Academy High School
James A. Long Elementary School
Moseley Elementary

(a) Participants: (continued)

(2) Schools within each System Represented:

St. Johns County (3)
(1st Institute)

Murray High School
R. B. Hunt Elementary School
Walter E. Harris School

Seminole County (6)
(1st and 2nd Institute)

Bear Lake Elementary
Crooms High School
Jackson Heights Elementary
Pinecrest Elementary
Rosenwald Elementary School

Sumter County (4)
(1st Institute)

J. R. E. Lee High School
Mills High School
South Sumter High School
Wildwood High School

Suwannee County (1)
(2nd Institute)

Suwannee High School

(b) Staff(1) Permanent Staff:

Dr. Robert B. Myers (director) was responsible for the proposal which initiated the institutes. He began on May 6, 1965, upon notice of approval of contract by U.S. Office of Education to publicize, recruit, plan with schools, develop the program, build a staff, and employ consultants. Dr. Myers guided the activities of both institutes.

Mrs. Johnnie Ruth Clark (a Negro doctoral candidate in the College of Education, University of Florida, on leave of absence from Gibbs Junior College, St. Petersburg, Florida) joined the staff on June 1, 1965, and worked extensively in collecting printed materials, building a library, and putting together the participant's kits. She presented a lecture on curriculum and instruction and served as a resource person on curriculum and instruction. Mrs. Clark served in both institutes.

(b) Staff (continued)

Dr. Nathaniel Hickerson (assistant professor of education, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana) is a serious student of desegregation patterns in public schools and communities. In his presentations he offered many suggestions regarding plans for desegregation. He was excellent in working with county school teams by probing and criticizing their plans and recommendations. He forced them to look critically at their plans and served in the 1st institute.

Dr. Marie Fielder (professor of education, University of California, Berkeley, California) served as a staff member in the 3rd week of the 1st institute and during the 1st week of the 2nd institute. She is a poised, attractive, and competent Negro educator, and completely destroyed the Negro stereotype held by many southern whites. Dr. Fielder was an excellent advisor to the county school teams and presented lectures on the sociology of school students, curriculum, and in-service education.

Dr. Phil Constans, Jr. (high school principal, Cocoa Beach, Florida) a past president and presently a board member of the Florida Education Association, was exceptionally successful in approaching the participants on a professional commitment level. In a presentation he recounted instances in his own life when ignorance was replaced by awareness and awareness grew to commitment. He was very good in helping county teams with their plans. Dr. Constans served during the 2nd institute.

Dr. Charles Foster (professor of education, University of Florida) has written in guidance and counseling and is now serving as the editor of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Human Rights. He devoted much of his time to county team work and was instrumental in their good showing. He served during the 2nd institute and will devote 50 percent of his time during the coming year to institute work.

Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Haines, Mrs. Mirabai Phanuel, and Mr. Ricardo Girona each served half-time as graduate teaching assistants. They were responsible for audio-visual aids, reproduction of materials, checking attendance, and assisted in working with school teams, the program, and materials. Mrs. Phanuel, a doctoral candidate and native of India, spoke about the caste system in India and measures undertaken to alleviate the problem. Mr. Girona, a Cuban refugee and social worker in New York City for two years prior to enrolling as a doctoral student, spoke concerning the race relations in Cuba.

(b) Staff (continued)(2) Consultants and Guest Lecturers:

Dr. Paul Adams (associate professor of Psychiatry, University of Florida) stirred up the whites with a no-holds-barred presentation by suggesting that they get out of the profession if they couldn't accept desegregation. He was active in large group discussions questioning motives and feelings of white participants. I feel he made a most positive contribution.

Dr. Maurice Ahrens (professor of education, University of Florida) presented a fine paper entitled "Cultural Differences: Instructional Implications." Dr. Ahrens is a good resource person for persons studying instruction for the disadvantaged. He was approached by several county teams to serve as a consultant during the coming year.

Dr. L. L. Boykin (academic vice-president, Florida A. & M. University, Tallahassee) made a fine presentation on the Negro and education--past, present, and future. Some whites liked him best of the Negro consultants, some Negroes felt he was too conservative. He took a moderate, studied position pointing out problems both races need to solve.

Mr. Fletcher Baldwin (associate professor of law, University of Florida) is a specialist on constitutional law. He traced the history of court decisions and legislative acts leading up through the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He spiced his presentation with comments of disdain for concepts of white supremacy. Mr. Baldwin is active in legal work for civil rights groups in Gainesville and in Florida.

Dr. Paul Clifford (registrar and professor of social psychology, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia) made a great presentation entitled "Sociological and Psychological Dimensions of Cultural Deprivation." He is a fine consultant.

Dr. Arthur Combs (professor of education, University of Florida) is a national authority on personality and phenomenological psychology. He showed the cultural and experimental basis for intelligence and discounted the meaning of I.Q. measurements.

Dr. Denton Cook (assistant superintendent, Hillsborough County Schools, Tampa, Florida) explained the meaning of the Title 405 for school systems, told how Hillsborough went about getting their contract, and offered suggestions for writing proposals.

(b) Staff (continued)

Dr. Muriel Crosby (assistant superintendent, Wilmington, Delaware) told the story of curriculum development needed to provide for all children. She was well received and made a fine contribution to the institute.

Dr. Vynce Hines (professor of education, University of Florida) reviewed Myrdal's "The American Dilemma," pointing out the meaning of common core and alternatives of our culture. He then developed a conception of a new common core including minority groups in the main stream of American life.

Dr. Ralph Kimbrough (professor of education, University of Florida) discussed the results of research dealing with community power structures and their effect on educational decision making. He gave clues for identifying the membership and suggestions for influencing these groups to supporting educational change.

Dr. Hal Lewis (professor of education, University of Florida) is a member of the Florida Advisory Committee to the U. S. Civil Rights Commission and has been active in this work for a decade. Dr. Lewis made two presentations to the institute: one, "Morality and Immorality" and the other, "Caste and Class in the South." He is an outstanding speaker. Dr. Lewis, along with Dr. Proctor, was named as the outstanding consultant of the institute by the participants.

Dr. John Martin (assistant superintendent, Atlanta, Georgia) traced the sequence of decisions leading to the desegregation of Atlanta schools. He offered helpful suggestions for implementing desegregation plans.

Mr. Dave Meuser (social studies supervisor, Brevard County Schools, Melbourne, Florida) in fashion similar to Dr. Cook presented the Brevard 405 plan for inservice education and assisted those county teams in the preparation of 405 plans while in the institute.

Dr. Kenneth Morland (sociologist, Randolph-Macon Women's College, Lynchburg, Virginia) was a most helpful and stimulating consultant. He reported on his research dealing with race awareness, social class, and disadvantaged white and Negro youth.

Dr. Sam Proctor (history professor, University of Florida) prepared a paper on the history of the Negro in Florida. It was excellent background material and I feel his presentation did more than anything else in pointing up the exploitation of the Negro. He was named by the participants, along with Dr. Lewis, as the outstanding speaker of the institute.

(b) Staff (continued)

Mr. W. C. Shattles (superintendent, Ashland, Kentucky) made a fine presentation and helped greatly in setting the goal for the institute of compliance with personal commitment. He expressed a philosophy of education for all children that had real meaning to the participants.

Dr. Charles Smith (sociologist, Florida A. & M. University, Tallahassee, Florida) gave a truly great presentation on the Negro subculture in the south with many examples of how a Negro sees himself and the world. Dr. Smith is the most dynamic and able Negro sociologist I have heard.

Dr. Joseph Vandiver's (sociologist, University of Florida) presentation entitled "Pressures and Resistances to Change" recounted the civil rights forces at work in America since 1900 emphasizing the advances made in the past 10 years. He compared the situation in Atlanta with that of St. Augustine, Florida, showing the opposing factors to change that lead either to settlement or conflict.

Dr. J. B. White (professor of education, University of Florida) lead off the Institute with a factual description of the progress toward desegregation made in the southern states. He compared the percentage of money spent on white and Negro pupils under segregation and showed the progress, though slight, of the percentage of gain of Negro pupils in formally all white schools over the past decade.

Dr. Kimball Wiles, Dean, College of Education, University of Florida. Dr. Wiles presented guidelines for interpersonal communication, emphasizing non-verbal cues that hinder or contribute to improved human relations. Many suggestions were given to facilitate communication in the classroom, in the office, and in the community. The necessity of strengthening communication between persons and between groups as we move toward complete desegregation was underscored.

Mrs. Pearline Yates (teacher, P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, Gainesville, Florida) told of her experiences as a teacher with an integrated class. She recounted several problems with resistant parents and how she worked with them to alleviate their fears. Most significant to the participants was the remark that many suspected problems just did not materialize.

(c) Methods:

The methods used in the institute included lectures, large group discussions, small group discussions, county school team meetings on action plans for desegregation, consultation with county school teams and with individuals, reading and discussion of readings, county school team reports both written and oral, role playing, case studies, and films.

Of the 85 clock hours devoted to each institute, approximately 22 hours were taken by presentations, and an additional 22 hours by large group discussions. Twenty-seven hours were spent in county school team meetings working up action plans, using consultants and staff, examining readings and case studies. The remainder of the time, approximately 14 hours, was spent in county team reports which always included recommendations to be made to their superintendent and board.

All lecturers would be invited back again if I were to hold another institute. They provided much current and background information from the fields of history, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, law, and education. The majority of our discussions were spirited and open. The technique of requiring county school team action plans encouraged overt involvement and commitment among those working up a report and helped others who heard the report to do the same. More role playing would help as well as additional films. Our films were good but there is a need for some directly on the subject. The consultants and staff did a fine job of counseling and guiding individuals and county school teams. Overall, the printed materials were helpful, but additional pamphlets need to be developed on the topics of desegregation of faculties, school activities, and instruction of desegregated pupils.

The participants recommended that the same balance between lectures, discussion and work sessions be maintained in any future institute of the same duration. I feel that everyone had a chance to "say his piece" sometime and somewhere in our program. The blocks of time scheduled for our activities were large enough, that is, from one and a half hours to two hours each, that we had a built-in flexibility that allowed us to take advantage of those spontaneous and highly motivated and beneficial activities that occur.

(d) Facilities:

The air conditioned stage, large and equipped with modern tables and chairs, of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School auditorium served as our primary meeting place. We had sufficient space for team meetings and ideal conditions for presentations and films. Adequate parking for cars was nearby.

(e) Teaching Aids:

In planning for the materials to be used by the institute, the staff drew up criteria to be used as a basis for selection. Materials were defined as pamphlets, booklets, reprints, leaflets and bulletins. The criteria were as follows:

1. Seek all materials dealing with the political, economic, social, psychological, and educational aspects of desegregation.
2. All material dealing with the political or legal aspects should be limited to present legislation and interpretation except historical materials.
3. Secure copies, if possible, of all legal acts, in their original forms, and interpretations from governmental sources.
4. Check all the university libraries and organized agencies for bibliographies on desegregation. When possible, review all materials for their relevance to desegregation and the school before including them on the final bibliography.
5. When contacting agencies, secure copies of their materials for each participant. Review samples of this material before ordering. When bulk quantity is not available, secure two or more copies for institute library.
6. Newspaper and popular magazine articles can be used for the institute library. When these articles have to be clipped, mount them for handling.
7. Make a special effort to secure some materials which show how school desegregation has worked both North and South but especially in the South.
8. Look for some materials which teachers can use in the classroom.
9. All films should be previewed before scheduling them for the institute.
10. Sources used for securing materials should be made available to the participants.

The participants kit included a bibliography prepared by the staff of available materials either in the institute library or one of the university libraries. Copies of the most significant materials were ordered for the participants and were included in the kits. Note pads, pencils, announcements, and other miscellaneous materials were added to the kits.

(e) Teaching Aids: (continued)

The institute library was set up in the meeting room which made it available to the county teams at all times. Materials from this library were borrowed by participants for weekends for examination by members of their teaching staffs at home.

At the beginning of the institute, the participants became acquainted with the materials and the library facilities were available to them. One of the graduate assistants was designated as librarian and handled all requests for materials. In the original briefing attention was called to significant materials which could not be secured for the institute such as current books on research studies. Sources for ordering materials and films were discussed. It was pointed out that the best sources, other than federal agencies, for securing up-to-date materials promptly were the National Education Association and the Anti-Defamation League. It was our experience that other agencies did not have current publications and were slow in replying to correspondence.

The Anti-Defamation League made available to the institute a special library of materials which are distributed through their office.

Some of the problems involved were the dearth of up-to-date materials and films. The major problem was securing appropriate films. We showed "Picture in Your Mind," and "The High Wall." Both are very good films.

The materials included in the participants' kits are listed below.

1. American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission of NEA. 1965.
2. Assistance on Special Educational Problems Occasioned by School Desegregation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1965.
3. Civil Rights Digest. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, August, 1964.
4. Civil Rights Under Federal Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission, Number 1, January, 1965.
5. Dodson, Dan W. Crisis in the Public Schools: Desegregation Northern Style. New York: Council for American Unity, February, 1965.

(e) Teaching Aids: (continued)

6. Emotional Aspects of School Desegregation. New York: Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 1960.
7. "The First Work of These Times." American Education. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, April, 1965.
8. General Statement of Policies Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, April, 1965.
9. Gertrude Noar. "Interpreting Race Relations in Education to the Community."
10. Grambs, Jean D. Education in a Transition Community. New York: The National Conference of Christians and Jews, July, 1958.
11. Grambs, Jean D. A Guide To School Integration. New York: Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 255.
12. Grants to School Boards to Assist in Dealing with Problems Incident to Desegregation. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, January 25, 1965.
13. Public Education. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, October, 1964.
14. Public Law 88-352, 88th Congress, H. R. 7152.
15. Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, "Guidelines for Testing Minority Group Children," The Journal of Social Issues. 20: No. 2, April, 1964.
16. Tanner, James C. "Dixie Teachers Report Their Pupils Learn Well In Mixed-Race Schools." The Wall Street Journal. Monday, January 20, 1964.
17. White, J. B. Can We Afford To Close Our Public Schools? Gainesville: University of Florida, December, 1959.

(f) Informal Program:

Much benefit in building morale and fostering interaction among all participants accrued from our 30 minute coffee break each morning, and from scheduled lunches of the staff with different groups of participants. Several participants stated that living together in Broward Hall provided the opportunity to get together and have those informal and meaningful sessions where a person really gets to know others. The staff noticed the development of car pools soon after the beginning of each institute which included members of both races as they drove to lunch and home on the weekends. The importance of being together in these many ways cannot be overemphasized.

(g) Participation of Local School Systems:

Recruitment of the participants was accomplished by contacting school superintendents who nominated teams of central office administrators, principals and supervisors to comprise the representation of the school system in the institute. All participants were members of a county school team. Upon the acceptance of a team by the institute director, each superintendent was mailed a short questionnaire which he and his team meeting together were instructed to complete and return. Many suggestions as to content and consultants were received. In addition, some problems to be studied by each team while attending the institute were identified in advance. These questions were considered by the director in his choice of consultants and in his planning with respect to schedule and sequence of activities.

It is my experience that the selection method discussed above provides for more motivation, more purpose, and more fruitful planning by participants. The knowledge that their problems are real, that they are shared by the superintendent, and that they are expected to find solutions and make recommendations upon their return home ^{from} a continuity of study, from home to institute and back home. Follow-up in this process is a built-in ingredient. Of course, additional follow-up stimulation is necessary. The director and members of the staff have already accepted invitations to take part in inservice meetings of several school systems during the coming year. In addition, a three day follow-up meeting is planned for both institutes to be held in February, 1966. Monroe, Hillsborough and Clay Counties (holding countywide staff meetings in late August, 1965) have requested the services of consultants. Follow-up planning with other school systems is now underway. Several systems, including Manatee, Brevard, Polk, and Hillsborough, have reserved places for participants in our year-long institute beginning in September, 1965. The staff, during the institute, assisted in the preparation of Title 405 requests; among the 405 plans developed in the institute were those of Polk, Marion, Collier, Pinellas and Columbia County school systems. We expect that many of the systems will develop Title 405 inservice programs, and that others will benefit from year-long staff consultation.

(h) Consultation and Guidance:

Opportunities for consultation and guidance were plentiful in both the formal and informal activities of the institute. Very little assistance was requested in matters of human relations or understanding self, but much help was sought regarding desegregation planning. I feel that everyone left the institute knowing that "tokenism" is not enough, and knowing too that the many devices to protect "tokenism" are recognizable for what they are. Several county team plans were "beefed-up" after sessions with the staff. I believe that much good was accomplished by consultants and staff in sessions with individuals and teams.

(i) Content:

The content of the institutes included presentations by the staff and consultants, and problems and solutions initiated by the participants. Consultants and staff presented content under the following general headings:

1. Historical analyses of legal, economic, social, psychological, and educational aspects of segregation and desegregation.
2. Sociological and psychological factors of the current status of the culture, especially of the Negro.
3. The role of education in correcting injustice and providing equal educational opportunity.
4. The moral, legal, religious, and social responsibilities of the south in solving the problem of Negro inequality.
5. Analysis of prejudice and building better human relations.
6. Desegregation planning in school systems.
7. Planning for integration in the classroom, in the school, and in the system.

Participant team problems, generally practical in nature, occupied much of the attention of the work sessions. A consensus listing of these problems is listed below.

1. How can we attack the problems of orientation of pupils, parents, and faculty as we move to desegregated schools?
2. How can we improve the image of each school so that it will be attractive to all children?
3. What kind of an inservice program do we need?
4. How can we facilitate the smooth transition from a segregated to a desegregated faculty?

(i) Content: (continued)

5. How can we adapt school organization and curriculum to provide for varying levels of achievement in an integrated school?

6. In what ways can we develop and improve techniques of instruction for the disadvantaged child?

7. How can we handle transportation, social, and extra-curricular problems?

A continuous effort was made to encourage participants to study and discuss their problems, and to relate the consultants' and staffs' presentations to those problems confronting the participant teams.

In our final evaluation session, suggestions were made that future summer institutes should be at least three weeks long. Content presented by staff and consultants could be capsuled into a short span of time, but content acted upon by participants requires changes in attitudes, examination of personal prejudices, and the building of new patterns of interaction. Sufficient time is needed for these kinds of outcomes.

(j) Evaluation:

Evaluation of organization, consultants, participants, work sessions, staff roles and materials was daily occurrence by the staff. Many modifications were made in the program, consultant and staff assignment to county team work sessions as we attempted to find the right person or best idea to encourage, persuade and move participants to a more open point of view, or to develop more complete plans for school desegregation.

Participants were involved in evaluation both informally and in a formal fashion. The staff asked for feelings, ideas, and concerns of participants at lunch, coffee breaks, and elsewhere. As a part of the institute organization, a participant committee representing county teams met periodically with the staff to discuss progress and needs to be met. A short questionnaire was developed to assess participants' opinions of individual consultants, organization, and methods. The plans for a three-day follow-up meeting were initiated and developed by participants.

The evaluation sessions following the county team reports were primarily participant oriented. When a plan for desegregation appeared to skirt the issues or was not "enough" there was instantaneous appraisal, questioning, and probing as to motives and fears. Many suggestions were given those making the report. Some of these were included in the final recommendations each team took home for the superintendent and board.

(j) Evaluation: (continued)

The staff jotted down and kept an anecdotal record of remarks made throughout the institute. While these remarks are not indicative of consensus, they do represent the depth of feeling and the broad range of feelings among the participants.

1. A Negro participant--"Thirty years of hostility is beginning to crack."
2. A white participant--"I regret that it's over, I wish it would last three more weeks."
3. Several, Negro and white--"This is the richest experience I've had in my lifetime."
4. "The finest presentations I've ever heard in a conference."
5. "Rich is the only word to describe our speakers."
6. "I've never seen a group of lecturers that went together so well."
7. "That speaker was good but the Negro is right, the white is wrong."
8. "Three weeks of brain-washing."
9. "I never learned so much so fast."
10. "The novelty has worn off and it's now just another job to get done."
11. "I'm tired of talking about it, let's get home and get at it."
12. "Now I'm aware of the extent of Federal determination to desegregate."
13. "Dr. Myers, if it meets with your approval, I would be willing and pleased to sing 'The Lord's Prayer' at the closing of the Institute this afternoon."

(k) Plans for Follow-up:

Plans for the follow-up of the summer institutes are built in to the year-long institute now underway. These include:

1. Representatives of county school systems in attendance at the summer institutes to attend the year-long institute involving on-campus and on-the-job activities.

(k) Plans for Follow-up: (continued)

2. Consultant help for school systems at their request.
3. Visitation by staff to all systems during fall and winter.
4. Several short conferences to be held on campus and in the field for board members, supervisors, counselors, teachers.
5. A three-day follow-up meeting on campus for summer participants scheduled for February, 1966.
6. Mailing of new printed materials and those developed during year-long institute.

(l) Overall Evaluation:

It is our opinion that the two three-weeks institutes were characterized by definite growth on the part of all participants, and this would certainly include the staff. This growth was about evenly divided in terms of impact. Part occurred in the area of information and knowledge, especially knowledge in depth about the historic deprivation of the Negro leading up the present necessity. Part--possibly the most important--has to do with a development or maturation of attitudes on the part of the people taking part.

This was a very human situation. Of the 133 participants, it was possible to identify people whose attitudes toward desegregation ranged all the way from outright resistance to enthusiastic determination to promote the change as rapidly and as completely as possible.

This might have been expected, since the counties represented ranged from Dade, Pinellas, and Palm Beach Counties--cosmopolitan and big--to small counties representative of the old South, in Central and Northern Florida. I personally was surprised, at the beginning of the institute, to observe the strength of segregationists feeling evidenced by some participants. Some of these people began to show signs of change as the impact of numerous presentations and many exchanges of feeling and opinion took place. However, even to the end, it was quite possible that a small number of the people present were still seeking ways to reinforce their original determination to resist. This might be said of just a handful. Others of segregationist leanings, some by their own admission, were yielding to the new order. If one can judge by their comments and those of their associates, their yielding came either from increasing conviction that school desegregation is inevitable and the best must be made of it, or from a sort of actual conversion resulting from finding out, almost for the first time, what American society has actually done to the Negro, how it came about, and why an intolerable situation can no longer be accepted.

(1) Overall Evaluation: (continued)

Two comments by men of very strong segregationist leanings might be pondered. One man said, "I have heard some things that irritated me, some that made me downright mad, and some that have made me think." At the end of the institute, this man seems to be still at the far right of the scale, an impression strengthened by his behavior of manifest indifference and hostility. At the same time, he seems to be saying that he will do what he has to do, and no more.

Another man, on the way out of a meeting toward the end of the institute said, "I still say that it's up to someone else to say who should be in our schools and it is our job just to do the educating." He made this remark in rejoinder to a half-joking comment by his companion, "Isn't there anything we can do to help. . . get religion?"

Looking at what appears to have been more positive developments for some participants, a number of those who appeared to be very resistant to desegregation came up with surprisingly good plans and observations about future desegregation programs in their schools. Lake, Clay, and Sumter Counties which have long been a hot-bed of resistance to any yielding in the field of human rights, presented what seemed to be a very fair program for moving into school desegregation. These representatives gave every indication of planning to promote constructive programs in their counties, and one of them even said, "We're committed to this thing, and I mean that sincerely."

Other semi-rural counties came up with plans and suggestions indicating that they would make serious efforts to implement the program, even though they acknowledged that they had little reason to feel that their administrators and board members, back home, were in any way happy about the situation.

Some of the participants appeared to be resigned to a "We have to do it, so let's do the best we can" position, and one can only speculate as to the degree to which they experienced personal or professional growth in terms of recognizing the basic significance of the change that is taking place.

One or two reactions to specific presentations were very noticeable. Several participants complained about the presentation of a psychiatrist, implying that he threatened them and "broke down a lot of the good will that was beginning to build up here." Reaction to the presentation of a woman speaker, a very poised and effective Ph.D. from California, was outspoken and somewhat fearful on the part of some participants. They seemed to be threatened since they had--apparently--never seen a Negro woman, or heard one, of this calibre and level of ability and appearance before. Staff members felt that these people were really undergoing a shock as their traditional stereotypes were crumbling.

(1) Overall Evaluation: (continued)

In the delegations from some of the smaller counties one still got the feeling that the Negro participants were finding it difficult to say what they really believed. But one also got the feeling that there were other delegations in which exchange of ideas and feelings were remarkably free. In other words the success of the institute in providing an opportunity for this kind of participation was probably very much what might be expected in view of the weight of tradition and custom in this particular region. On the whole I would say this influence was very much on the plus side, but short of being what one would ideally hope for.

It is worthy to note that the attendance was almost perfect and that no one withdrew from either institute. One lady missed the last week of the first institute because of a death in the family.

The Institute was a rich experience. The provision of such a wide variety of most competent speakers and consultants gave it this flavor. I doubt if any three weeks' experience could have been richer or more rewarding in its total contribution to an understanding of the depth and scope and meaning of the problem faced by the nation in this field of social responsibility.

It is difficult to see how any one who was present and who listened could help but find his ideas modified, matured, and corrected by what in effect was a broad attack on the problem of racial injustice from the moral, spiritual, political, and educational viewpoints.

At the last moment in thinking about this evaluation, it does occur that although we gave passing attention to the economic and vocational problems of the Negro, we probably should have had one or two qualified people discuss directly the problems of education of the Negro in relation to vocational guidance and adjustment. What are the problems here, and how can education meet its responsibilities to the Negro in what might be thought of as the vocational guidance field?